DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 966 IR 054 314

AUTHOR Huisman, Melissa Ann
TITLE Marcive Preprinted Labels: Is Time Saved a Penny Earned?
PUB DATE Sep 92
NOTE 38p.; Master's Thesis, Kent State University. Appendixes contain broken print.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Libraries; Depository Libraries; *Government Publications; Higher Education; *Library Expenditures; *Library Technical Processes
IDENTIFIERS Kent State University OH; *Labels; *Vendors

ABSTRACT

Despite technological advances in the processing of library materials, some Government Documents Units are still laboriously hand-lettering call numbers onto each document. Recently Marcive, Inc., has offered a new service that will give Government Documents librarians the chance to break into the 21st century by using preprinted labels, produced directly from the Government Printing Office shipping lists. Marcive claims that these attractive, laser-printed labels will reduce time and error in processing. However, the cost may be prohibitive for many libraries. This study aims to test the labels, not only to see if they would reduce time and effort in processing, but also to discover any other favorable or unfavorable aspects of the service which could aid a library in its decision to subscribe to this new service. This study found that the labels did reduce processing time, although not by a very large margin. Calculated on an annual basis, the savings would be about 18 hours per year. The errors made while processing were not significantly different. Some of the favorable aspects of the service include the neat appearance of the label, the elimination of specially trained "letterers," and the ease in reading and filing of the documents with preprinted labels. Some of the unfavorable aspects were the backing up of document shipments while awaiting the arrival of the labels, the physical layout of the labels on the backing sheet, and the problem of extra labels for plates and pieces. Copies of a sample page of Marcive Labels and a sample GPO shipping list are appended. (Contains 19 references.) (Author/KRN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IR

ED352966

MARCIVE PREPRINTED LABELS: IS TIME SAVED A PENNY EARNED?

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Melissa Ann Huisman

September, 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Melissa Huisman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1805314

Master's Research Paper by

Melissa Ann Huisman

B.A., Western Michigan University, 1984

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1993

Approved by

Advisor Lois Buttlar Date 9-21-92

ABSTRACT

Despite technological advances in the processing of library materials, some Government Documents Units are still laboriously hand-lettering call numbers onto each document. Recently, Marcive, Inc., has offered a new service that will give Government Documents librarians the chance to break into the twenty first century by using preprinted labels, produced directly from the Government Printing Office shipping lists. Marcive claims that these attractive, laser-printed labels will reduce time and error in processing. However, the cost may be prohibitive for many libraries. This study aims to test the labels, not only to see if they would reduce time and error in processing, but also to discover any other favorable or unfavorable aspects of the service which could aid a library in its decision to subscribe to this new service.

This study found out that the labels did reduce processing time, although not by a very large margin. Calculated on an annual basis, the savings would be about 18 hours per year. The errors made while processing were not significantly different. Some of the favorable aspects of the service include the neat appearance of the label, the elimination of specially trained "letterers", and the ease in reading and filing of the documents with preprinted labels. Some of the unfavorable aspects were the backing up of document shipments while awaiting the arrival of the labels, the physical layout of the labels on the backing sheet, and the problem of extra labels for plates and pieces.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....1

Need for the Study.....3

Purpose of the Study.....4

Hypothesis/Objectives.....4

Definition of Terms.....4

Limitations of Study.....8

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....9

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....14

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS.....17

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....24

Summary of Staff Comments.....24

Recommendations to Marcive, Inc.....25

Recommendations for Further Research.....25

APPENDICES.....26

Appendix A - Marcive Preprinted Labels.....27

Appendix B - Shipping List.....28

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....29

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Processing Times for Preprinted Labels.....18

Table 2: Processing Times for Hand Printed Labels.....19

Table 3: Comparison of Processing Time Means for Preprinted and Hand Printed Labels.....20

Table 4: Comparison of Processing Time Means for Preprinted and Hand Printed Labels on an Annual Basis.....20

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper was written with the help of all of the staff members of the Kent State University Government Documents Unit including Rosemary Harrick, Joan Zeeb-Roman, Diane May, and Betty Eckhart.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

More than a century ago, Melville Dewey taught librarians to write with a special "library script." Neat, even writing was necessary back then to keep the cards and labels legible and uniform. Today, with the advent of the typewriter and the computer, this special "library script" is no longer a required course at library schools. The card catalog is now an on-line catalog and viewed from a computer screen. If cards are still used, they are mostly typed or printed from a computer. Labels, likewise are typed or printed. With personal computers communication is done via word processing and electronic mail. Handwriting is now unnecessary. Or is it?

In all of the library there is still one last holdout - the Government Documents Department. Originally, in such early works as The Manual for the Administration of the Federal Documents Collection Libraries[1] and The Administration of Government Documents Collections,[2] librarians were instructed to handletter each document using neat, legible handwriting. Back then there was no choice; computers were certainly not readily available. And, even though typewriters were fairly commonplace, perhaps the

---

[1]Ellen Jackson. A Manual for the Administration of the Federal Documents Collection in Libraries (Chicago: American Library Association, 1955), pp. 80-81.

[2]Rebekah M. Harleston and Carla J. Stoffle, Administration of Government Documents Collections (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1974), pp. 87-88.

machine itself, or a person trained to use it, was not readily available.

Even presently, in the latest edition of The Federal Depository Library Manual (1985), librarians are still specifically told to "print" the call number on the document.[3] Theoretically, a typewriter or a computer could be used to "print" on labels, which could then be affixed to the documents. Yet, in common everyday practice, some Government Depository Libraries are still dutifully following instructions and laboriously handlettering each item as it is unpacked.

Why is this? Well, even beyond the fact that libraries are instructed to do so in the manual, there is another important reason--it is faster. Boxes of documents come almost daily to depository libraries, and to cope with the sheer volume of them, it is faster to write directly on the document itself, then to type a label. Another reason is that in the past, even if one did take the extra time to type a label, librarians found that some labels did not always stick around long enough, leaving a document lost with no place to go.

Today, however, there is a new option for government documents librarians. Marcive Inc., a San Antonio company known for its database of bibliographic records for the Government Printing Office, the National Library of Medicine, and others, has in the past provided catalog cards, custom cataloging,

---

[3]Federal Depository Library Manual (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1985), Section 6: p. 7.

retrospective conversion, on-line catalogs and CD-Rom systems for its clients. Now it is offering a new service, preprinted labels, produced directly from the Government Printing Office's shipping lists for use in depository libraries.[4]

These laser printed labels, delivered twice a week by Federal Express, come in call number order on an 8 1/2 x 11 sheet and just peel off. They are on white paper and are about 1/2 inch wide and 2 1/2 inches long. Underneath each call number is a brief title of the document, which can be used to aid in identifying the correct call number, and also peeled off and attached to the document.(See Appendix A). All the processer has to do is peel off the correct label and affix it to the proper document.

Need for the Study

Marcive claims that this product will not only be a great time saver but will also cut down on transcription errors. This sounds like a really great idea, until one gets to the price tag. This year it costs $1,895.00 for a year's service. If the library is currently a GPO (Government Printing Office) customer, the price is discounted to $1,700.00. This does not include any labels for microfiche. Because of the financial squeeze put on most library's today, ordering this service would require some justification for the cost.

---

[4]Michael Rogers, "Marcive Offers One-Stop Shopping for Libraries," Library Journal 115 (August 1990): 26.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of the study is to see whether or not Marcive preprinted labels will actually reduce the time spent in processing shipments and the number of labeling errors. A secondary purpose is to obtain information related to any other favorable of disfavorable aspects of the service.

Hypothesis/Objectives

The hypothesis is then, that the use of Marcive preprinted labels will make no difference in the amount of time needed or number of errors made in labeling government documents.

Definition of Terms

Since everyone is not familiar with Government Documents Departments or the Depository Library System, it is necessary to first define several terms and explain some general procedures within a Government Documents Department.

Government Depository Libraries

The Depository Library System was established by Congress in 1895 to provide annual reports, statistics, research studies and other federal agency materials to the general public, free of charge. There are over 1,390 libraries in the United States in this system. Fifty-one are regional depository libraries and receive all publications available for distribution from the U.s.Government Printing Office. The rest of the libraries only receive those documents which they feel will best serve their public. They use a selection profile method to receive a certain

percentage of the documents.[5]

Processing

Documents arrive daily, in boxes, envelopes and tubes. The general processing procedure includes the following activities: First, the librarian opens each box to see what is inside--for reference reasons, to sort out the titles that are transferred to the main library, and to count the items. Next, the processer removes the shipping list.

The shipping list is a list of each item that GPO is sending in that particular box (See Appendix B). It has an item number, a classification or call number, and a short title. It is from this shipping list that the processor knows what call number to write on the document. Using the shipping list, all the items are first put in order. Next, one by one, each document is checked off next to its item number and the call number is written in the top left hand corner of each piece with an indelible black pen. If the cover of the document is dark, the call number is written on a small white label and then attached to the corner, using care not to cover any title information on the document itself.

Just the writing of the call number itself is full of precautions. First of all, it has to be extremely neat and legible. Much care must be taken to keep the 5's from looking like S's, the D's from looking like O's, and the I's, slashes and

---

[5]Federal Depository Library Manual (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1985), Introduction, p. 1.

lowercase l's from looking like 1's -- not to mention, making sure that the number is copied correctly from the shipping list in the first place.

"Sudoc Number"

A "Sudoc number" or Superintendent of Documents classification number consists of various parts. The first part consists of a capital letter or letters representating a Government department or agency.

Example: TD for Transportation Department.

The letters are followed by a number representing the agency as a whole, or a subordinate office. This figure is followed by a period.

Example: TD 4. for Federal Aviation Administration.

After the period, there is a number designating the series or category grouping of publications, followed by a colon. The number up to the colon is commonly referred to as the "stem" number.

Example: TD 4.10/4: FAA airworthiness directive biweekly listing.

The numbers after the colon represent individual publications in the series.

Example: TD 4.10/4:83-7 for issue 83-7.[6]

At some libraries the Sudoc number is written in two lines, dropping all the numbers after the colon onto the second line for

---

[6]Ponce, Jorge E. GPO Classification Manual: A Practical Guide to the Superintendent of Documents Classification System (Washington, D.C.: GPO, <1987>,Introduction, p. 2.

ease in reading and filing.

Separate Pieces

Another part of the processing procedure has to do with documents that are not one complete piece. Some documents have plates or maps tucked in envelopes in the back of the piece. These each have to be labeled and stamped in case they become separated from the "parent" piece. Some documents are small patches, or single sheets of paper or small maps. These have to be labeled themselves, and then placed in envelopes, which also have to be labeled. CD's and computer disks all present extra labeling procedures with containers and envelopes.

One other sort of document is termed "looseleaf." This is usually a serial that could be either part of a larger volume or maybe just a document issued that is not bound. It is up to the staff to insert a looseleaf item into some sort of binder or folder and then label that also.

Final processing procedures

Each item then MUST be stamped with the library's ownership stamp and the date of the shipping list. Because different libraries have different selection profiles, a library may not receive everything that is on the list. After every item has been checked off, any item number left must be checked against a "Non selection file" and then crossed off. Some items may have to be claimed and others may have had "rainchecks" issued, which means that the supply had run out, and after the next printing, the item will be sent. Then, the shipment is finished, the list

may be filed, and the documents sent on to be input on-line or checked in manually and shelved.

Time limitations

Depository libraries are instructed and obligated to get the documents out onto their shelves within ten days. The libraries are inspected periodically to make sure that they are meeting all depository library requirements. Boxes of documents sitting around for a long period of time would threaten their depository status by making the documents inaccessible to the public. Thus, processing must be completed without unnecessary delays.[7]

Limitations of Study

One limitation of this study is that it is only one library's experience with the Marcive preprinted labels and may not be representative of every library's experience.

---

[7]Guidelines for the Depository Library System with Minimum Standards for the Depository Library System (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1988), Section 5-7.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

No research specifically about Marcive preprinted labels has been found. The information about the labels was gained from a company brochure and a brief article in Library Journal reporting the existence of the service.[8]

Marcive, Inc. itself has been the subject of numerous articles, mostly related to its clean-up project in cooperation with several southwestern university libraries of the GPO MARC tapes.[9,10] Several articles have been written praising its microcomputer-based PAC (MARCIVE/PAC), its CD-ROM union catalog and specifically its new optical data disk called GPO CAT/PAC.[11,12,13] For the less technology-minded, there is also

---

[8]Michael Rogers, "Marcive Offers One-Stop Shopping for Libraries," Library Journal 115 (August 1990): 26.

[9]Myrtle Smith Bolner and Barbara Kile, "Documents to the People: Access Through the Automated Catalog," Government Publications Review 18 (January/February 1991): 51-64.

[10]Laura Tull, "Retrospective Conversion of Government Documents: the Marcive GPO Tape Clean-Up Project," Technicalities 9 (August 1989): 4-7.

[11]Kathy M. Jackson, "MARCIVE/PAC--A Simple, Easy Search System for Retrieving Bibliographic Records," The Laserdisk Professional 3 (January 1990): 80-87.

[12]Joni Gomez, "HARLIC (Houston Area Research Library Consortium) CD-ROM Union Catalog Project," CD-ROM Professional 3 (November 1990): 62-65.

[13]Karen Sendi, "Marcive, Inc. GPO CAT/PAC in Review," CD ROM Librarian 4 (November 1989): 60-64.

an article about Marcive's catalog card service.[14]

There has been much literature written about Government Depository Libraries, but none specifically mentioning the Marcive labels. Some general works about depository libraries include an excellent research work by Peter Hernon[15], which includes a historical introduction, a presentation and descriptive analysis of summary data about the depository library program (collected in the Biennial Survey), and suggestions and recommendations about how to use the summary data for strategic planning.

Another general work is a complete bibliographic guide to the literature on United States Government documents and government information policy by Alan Edward Schorr, which offers a historical overiew of the issues, trends, problems and accomplishments in the field of federal government publications.[16]

There have been many journal articles written about different aspects of the Goverment Depository Library System (and Government Documents Departments), especially concerning a separate versus an integrated collection or about electronic format materials. Some more general articles focus on the

---

[14]Bob Gaines, "A Source for Catalog Cards," The Unabashed Librarian 64 (1987): 31-2.

[15]Peter Hernon, GPO's Depository Library Program: A Descriptive Analysis, (New Jersey: Ablex, 1985).

[16]Alan Edward Schorr, Federal Documents Librarianship, 1879-1987 (Alaska: Denali Press, 1988).

system's history and its future.[17,18,19] Also, one whole issue of Illinois Libraries has been devoted to articles concerned with Federal Depository Libraries and Librarianship.[20]

Regional Depository Libraries have been the focus of two articles by Peter Hernon and Barbara Hale.[21,22]

As for literature about the more practical aspects of processing documents, including mention of labels, there is much. Some of the works are quite dated, yet still useful for procedures not affected by the on-line environment.[23,24,25]

---

[17]Peter Hernon and Charles R. McClure, "GPO's Depository Library Program: Building for the Future," Library Journal (April 1, 1988): 52-6.

[18]Bruce Morton, "The Depository Library System: A Costly Anachronism," Library Journal 112 (September 15, 1987): 52-4.

[19]William R. Kahles, "Congress, Higher Education, and the U.S. Federal Depository Program," Government Publications Review 13 (March/April 1986): 233-42.

[20]Janet Dickinson and Cheryl Nyberg, "Federal Depository Libraries and Librarianship (Special Issue)," Illinois Libraries 68 (May 1986): 285-355.

[21]Peter Hernon and David C.R. Heisser, "GPO Regional Depositories," The Reference Librarian 32 (1991): 43-55.

[22]Barbara Hale and Sandra McAninch, "The Plight of U.S. Government Regional Depository Libraries in the 1980's: Life in a Pressure Cooker," Government Publications Review 16 (July/August 1989): 387-95.

[23]Ellen Jackson, A Manual for the Administration of the Federal Documents Collection in Libraries (Chicago: American Library Association, 1955).

[24]Anne Ethelyn Markely, Library Records for Government Publications (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951).

[25]Rebekah M. Harleston and Carla J. Stoffle, Administration of Government Documents Collections (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1974).

More recent works include a manual by Leonard Adams written in 1984,[26] and an excellent handbook edited by Frederic J. Ohara[27] which includes excerpts from the Federal Depository Library Manual and Instructions to Depository Libraries. The work begins with some background material useful to the nondepository librarian who is beginning work in the field of government documents. It also includes a primer about the legislative process and the documents in that process, a description of the access channels available to users of congressional information, and a section devoted to the three national libraries.

Of course, the most useful are the manuals and guides printed by the GPO itself for the use of the libraries in the Depository Library Program.[28],[29],[30]

Within Alan Schorr's bibliographical work, mentioned previously, there were also several works concerning the processing of government documents in Depository Libraries,

---

[26]Adams, Leonard, Government Documents Technical Processing Manual 1984. (ERIC microfiche ED 244634)

[27]Informing the Nation: A Handbook of Government Information for Librarians Frederic J. O'Hara, editor. (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990).

[28]Federal Depository Library Manual (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1985).

[29]Ponce, Jorge E., GPO Classification Manual: A Practical Guide to the Superintendent of Documents Classification System (Washington, D.C.: GPO, <1987>.

[30]Government Depository Libraries: The Present Law Governing Designated Depository Libraries (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1984).

although none of them dealt specifically with Marcive labels.[31,32,33] He also lists three works done by Library Science students in the field of document processing.[34,35,36]

Lastly, there has been a lot written about time and cost studies for libraries. While none of these deal specifically with Marcive labels, they do give some background information and examples of other time/cost studies done in library settings. Two bibliographies of such articles were published recently in Collection Building and The Bottom Line.[37,38]

---

[31]Muriel C. Efron and Henry R. Stewart, "Processing and Maintenance of Federal Documents: Summary of Three Sessions," Southeastern Librarian 24 (Winter 1975): 34-35.

[32]Mary Ann Higdon, "Federal Documents Processing with O^C the Texas Tech Experience - Planning, Utilization and the Future, [In Government Documents and Microforms Meckler, 1984. pp. 89-97].

[33]Charles R. McClure and Coy L. Harmon, "Technical Processing of United States Government Printing Office Publications: Issues and Prospects," Technical Services Quarterly 1 (Fall-Winter, 1983): 177-98.

[34]Eleanor L. Best, Work Study of Government Documents Processing at Penrose Library, University of Denver, MLS Research Paper, 1977.

[35]Janice K. Chesser, Examination of Processing Methods Used by Regional Depository Libraries for Non-GPO Government Publications, University of North Carolina, MLS Paper, 1983.

[36]Richard Loreck, Survey of Methods Used in Preparing Government Publications for Use by the Public in the Six "Complete"Depository Libraries of Pennsylvania. Drexel Institute of Technology, MLS Thesis, 1951.

[37]Hayes, Sherman, "Costs, Costs, Costs...Give Me a Break!: A Brief Bibliography," The Bottom Line 2:3 (1988): 30-33.

[38]Aren, Lisa J., Webreck, Susan J., and Mark Patrick, "Costing Library Operations - A Bibliography," Collection Building 8:3 (1980): 23-28.

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

There are two objectives to this study. The first is to find out whether using Marcive preprinted labels will be faster and more accurate when processing documents. The second is to elicit comments from the staff members as to any favorable or disfavorable aspects of the labeling service. These two objectives call for two different research methods.

Objective 1:
Will Marcive Labels be Faster and More Accurate?

To solve the problem of whether preprinted labels really will save time and labor, an experiment is clearly the best research method. In this situation one can readily control most of the variables such as the same amount of material, the same kind of material, the same time period, the same workspace, the same worker, etc. as independent variables. The dependent variable then is the time it takes to process a shipment. One other dependent variable would be the amount of errors made in each shipment.

Specifically, for a two week period preprinted labels were received from Marcive for a random two week's shipments from GPO. After each box had been opened and checked and counted by the librarian, the processer noted the time and begin processing the shipment using the preprinted labels. The process is the same as

described above in the "Definition of Terms," only instead of hand lettering the number, the processer peeled off the appropriate strip from the Marcive sheet and affixed it to the document. After each document had been checked, labeled and stamped, and the shipping list crossed off, the processer again noted the time. She then divided the time it took to process the shipment, by the number of items labeled in each shipment to come up with an average time it took to label each piece. These three calculations were made for every shipment for two weeks. Then, the totals were averaged.

The next step in the experiment was to take another two weeks worth of GPO shipments at random and do the same thing, only this time, using the traditional hand lettering of each document. At the end of this two weeks both averages were compared, to see which way of labeling was faster, the traditional hand lettered method or the new preprinted method.

Also, the number of errors were tallied for each method and compared to see which method accounted for the most errors.

The results were presented in a table showing the shipment number, number of items in that shipment, time taken to process that shipment, and an average of time per item. These results were then projected on an annual basis, based on the two week work sample, to find out how much time one would save, if any, annually using the Marcive preprinted labels.

Objective 2:
Staff Member Comments

Beyond the experiment, one other way to get more information about the use of the labels, was to informally converse with each staff member involved with the new labels - from the one who actually does the processing, to the reference librarian searching them on the shelf, to the one who files them away each day. Their comments were analyzed to obtain feedback regarding the advantages of disadvantages of each labeling method.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

Experiment Findings

Analysis of the data collected in the experiment indicates a slight decrease in the time that it took to process a shipment using the preprinted labels. It took an average of .82 minutes (49 seconds) to process an item using the labels, and an average of .90 minutes (54 seconds) to process an item with hand lettering. (See Table 1 and Table 2.)

Comparing these two averages, there is a savings of .08 minutes or 5 seconds per item using the preprinted labels. (See Table 3.)

Projected annually this could mean a savings of about 18 hours per year in processing documents using the preprinted labels (Based on the fact that the library receives approximately 13,400 items per year). (See Table 4.)

As one can see, the time saved is not really a significant amount of time. Why isn't it greater? Well, the staff comments bring out several reasons.

One reason is that Marcive's labels are laid out one on top of another, with the brief title underneath. Because Marcive uses the shipping lists to make their labels, and not every depository library gets every item, there are a lot of extraneous labels on the page, and it is sometimes hard to distinguish which label is the correct one.

Table 1

Processing Times for Preprinted Lables

Shipping Lists	Min. to Process	No. of items	Min/Item
Shipment 92-0327-P	18	22	.82
Shipment 92-0329,30-P	23	29	.79
Shipment 92-0331,2-P	25	40	.62
Shipment 92-0309-P	12	11	1.09
Shipment 92-0338-P	7	9	.78
Shipment 92-0340-P	20	26	.77
Shipment 92-0339-P	7	15	.47
Shipment 92-C344-P	16	30	.53
Shipment 92-0335,6,7-P	41	49	.84
Shipment 92-0319-P	7	7	1.00
Shipment 92-0347-P	10	15	.67
Shipment 92-0346-P	27	44	.61
Shipment 92-0345-P	9	15	.60
Shipment 92-0350-P	17	25	.68
Shipment 92-0351-P	13	20	.65
Shipment 92-0348,9-P	40	60	.67
Shipment 92-0352-P	11	13	.85
Shipment 92-0353,4-P	27	36	.75
Shipment 92-0359-P	28	55	.51
Shipment 92-0357-P	19	20	.95
Shipment 92-0356-P	7	8	.88
Shipment 92-0355-P	15	21	.71
Shipment 92-0333,42-P	7	21	.81
Shipment 92-0360-P	13	18	.72
Shipment 92-0361-P	17	24	.71
Shipment 92-0362-P	12	15	.80
Shipment 92-0341-P	10	11	.91
Shipment 92-0367-P	31	30	1.03
Shipment 92-0368-P	16	26	.62
Shipment 92-0369-P	10	14	.71
Shipment 92-0370-P	16	21	.76
Shipment 92-0371-P	18	28	.64
Shipment 92-0374-P	22	33	.67
Shipment 92-0375,6-P	30	37	.81
Shipment 92-0377-P	18	28	.64
Total	719	881	.82

Table 2

Processing Times for Hand printed Lables

Shipping Lists	Min. to Process	No. of items	Min/Item
Shipment 92-0397-P	19	25	.76
Shipment 92-0396-P	17	18	.84
Shipment 92-0391-P	10	09	1.11
Shipment 92-0392-P	18	17	1.06
Shipment 92-0390-P	14	15	.93
Shipment 92-0401-P	14	12	1.17
Shipment 92-0400-P	23	29	.79
Shipment 92-0399-P	21	28	.75
Shipment 92-0398-P	18	20	.90
Shipment 92-0402-P	16	15	1.07
Shipment 92-0409-P	13	12	1.08
Shipment 92-0408-P	13	12	1.08
Shipment 92-0404-P	27	36	.75
Shipment 92-0403-P	15	14	1.07
Shipment 92-0414-P	24	28	.86
Shipment 92-0413-P	13	21	.62
Shipment 92-0411-P	17	15	1.13
Shipment 92-0410-P	11	13	.85
Shipment 92-0419-P	18	19	.95
Shipment 92-0418-P	14	12	1.17
Shipment 92-0417-P	24	22	1.09
Shipment 92-0416-P	20	22	.91
Shipment 92-0422-P	19	22	.86
Shipment 92-0420-P	14	14	1.00
Shipment 92-0423,4-P	26	38	.68
Total	438	488	.90

Table 3

Comparison of Processing Time Means for Preprinted and Hand printed Labels

Labelling Format	Mean
Preprinted	.82 min.
Hand printed	.90 min.
Difference	.08 min.

Table 4

Comparison of Processing Time Means for Preprinted and Hand printed Labels on an Annual Basis

Labelling Format	Mean
Preprinted	183.13 hours
Hand printed	201.00 hours
Difference	17.87 hours

Another more satisfactory answer is that some documents really have more than one piece. There could be extra plates in the back, separate maps or just an envelope or folder full of single sheets. These all need labeling. However, on the shipping list it is listed as only one piece, so Marcive makes only one label, through no fault of its own. So, extra time was spent in hand lettering anyway.

One other time consuming process was the fact that looseleaf items, normally just written on and inserted into folders later, had to be taken care of immediately to insure the label getting on the folder. This also necessitated a change in the workflow and used up additional time.

As for the number of errors, there was only one error reported using the preprinted labels. In this case, the processor pulled off the label immediately below the brief title, instead of the one above, calling attention to how easily that could be done. Familiarity may eliminate this error. Using the traditional handlettering, there were no mistakes made.

Staff Comments About Advantages and Disadvantages

The second objective of this study was to familiarize the staff with the labels and to ask them for any comments they might have concerning the use of Marcive preprinted labels. The following is a detailed analysis of their comments.

Advantages

As for advantages, the staff all agreed that the preprinted labels were much neater looking than the handwritten labels. However, one comment was that the printing was smaller, and harder to read. Another comment was that the black and white preprinted labels blended in with the other typed words on the white documents.

There was a general concensus that there would probably be less chance for human error, seeing that the processing is usually done by temporary students. All agreed that there would be no need to train anyone in handwriting skills.

The labels also were an advantage in that certain bound volumes would no longer have to be sent to the Processing Department in Technical Services for standard typed and covered labels. The preprinted labels could just be covered by Government Document Department staff members. The last advantage was that there is absolutely no chance of a filer misreading sloppy printing.

Disadvantages

Some of the disadvantages were that, first of all, the service is costly. This is perhaps the most important disadvantage.

Also, several people indicated by their comments that because the call number is printed all in one long line, it is much harder to read and to shelve.

The processor indicated that she still had to take extra time to cut the preprinted labels whenever they covered title information on the document.

One other major disadvantage, already mentioned, is the fact that no labels were given for extra plates or maps or pieces included with the document, making it necessary for the processor to handletter these pieces anyway.

Another disadvantage, totally unforeseen, was the fact that the labels from Marcive arrive by Federal Express twice a week, but the boxes from GPO arrive daily. Because of this, boxes of documents pile up, waiting for the labels, and the processing is then done all at once, putting a strain on the processor and the other staff members who must input the documents online and file them all.

One last caution was the fact that this service is not totally carefree; one must still be on the lookout for printing errors that Marcive has just reproduced from errors made on the original GPO shipping list.

Chapter V: CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions are that the Marcive preprinted labels did slightly decrease the time spent in processing documents. They did not significantly decrease the amount of errors, in fact. Although neglible in number, there were more errors made with the labels than without them. A summary of the staff comments regarding the advantages and disadvantages of using the preprinted labels follows below:

Summary of Staff Comments

Advantages:

Much neater looking, aesthetically pleasing
Less chance for human error
No need to train special letterer
No need to send Serials downstairs for permanent labels
No chance of filer misreading sloppy printing

Disadvantages:

Expensive
Call number is all in one line, harder to read and shelve
Call number missing end digits, limit to number of character
May have to cut strip occasionally to fit document
No labels given for extra plates or maps in back of document
Have to wait for labels to arrive, boxes pile up
Still have to watch out for shipping list errors

The government documents staff overall was in favor of using the Marcive preprinted labels.

Recommendations to Marcive, Inc.

Some recommendations that can be made to Marcive Inc. about improving the labels would be to provide extra labels for items with loose parts, enlarge the type, place the labels differently on the paper so that they can not be misread so easily, print the Sudoc number on two lines, (drop after the colon), and regulate and speed up delivery.

Recommendations for Further Research

Further research could be done by contacting other libraries that receive Marcive shipments and finding out what their response to the labels have been, what special problems they have encountered, and if their findings as to time and error saving have been more or less than those at Kent State University.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Copy of Marcive Labels

Appendix B: Copy of Shipping List

****
91-0812-P -- Dec. 12, 1991
****

A 13.2: R 48/6
Riparian Forest Buffers

A 13.78: FPL-RP- 506
Supporting Rural Wood Industry

A 21.34: 2531
Farm Broadcasters Letter No. 25

A 57.38: D 34/4
Soil Survey of De Witt County,

D 101.11: 11-5855- 209-10
TM 11-5855-209-10, Operator's M

D 101.77: 991/3
ADA, July-August 1991

D 101.9/6: 140-17/ 991
First U.S. Army USAR Strenght M

D 207.17: 896
All Hands, No. 896, November 19

D 301.6/5: Sm 7
[illegible] MSSQ/MSPOO, Guide to a Se[illegible]

EP 1.8: R 49
EPA, Environmental Risk: Your G

HE 20.4010/a: D 64/Spanish
Como Tomas tus Medicinas, tus D

I 19.42/4: 91-4114
Transmissivity of Perched Aquif

I 27.2: L 14/2
Transmissivity of Perched Aquif

I 27.20/2: 13/chap.1
Design Standards, Embankment Da

L 1.20/6: 991/46
Black News Digest, November 18,

L 1.78/2: 991/45
Business Press Service, Novembe

L 1.78: 991/46
Labor Press Service, November 1

L 1.79: 91-583
News, Special Assistant to Head

L 1.79: 91-586
News, Michigan Man Sentenced fo

L 1.79: 91-587
News, Alaska Trustee Ordered to

L 2.121/38: Scr 1/991
Area Wage Survey, Scranton-Wikes

NAS 1.9/4: 29/22
Scientific and Technical Aerosp

SBA 1.19: W 89/2/ 991
Working Together: A Guide to Fe

SBA 1.32/2: MP 25/2
SBA, Selecting the Legal Struct

SI 11.15: 991/4
The National Portrait Gallery C

T 17.6/3-4: 25/46
Customs Bulletin and Decisions,

T 22.51: 1040/Sch.D- 1/991
Continuation Sheet for Schedule

T 22.51: 1116/inst.991
1991 Instructions for Form 1116

T 22.51: 4972/inst./ 991
1991 Instructions for Form 4972

TD 5.4/2: 14-91
Navigation and Vessel Inspectio

Y 3.F 31/21-3: 14-2/ 991-1
FLRA Report of Case Decisions a

Y 3.F 31/21-3: 14-3/ no.319
FLRA Report of Case Decisions a

Y 3.F 31/21-3: 14/991- 10
FLRA Report of Case Decisions a

Y 3.F 31/21-3: 9/case no.727
FLRA Report of Case Decisions a

Y 3.F 31/21-3: 9/case no.728
FLRA Report of Case Decisions a

Y 3.F 31/21-3: 9/case no.729
FLRA Report of Case Decisions a

Y 3.F 31/21-3: 9/case no.730
FLRA Report of Case Decisions a

Y 3.F 31/21-3: 9/case no.731
FLRA Report of Case Decisions a

****
***** LAST LABEL *****
Run Date: 01/27/92

7-10-92 mc

GPO Form 3452
(R 7-86)
Box Number
92-415

Depository Shipping List No. 92-0374-P

Date June 26, 1992 Page 1 Of _____

Claims for nonreceipt of publications on this list under item numbers previously selected by a library must be postmarked within 60 calendar days of receipt of this shipment. When filing a claim for missing publications, please return a copy of the list on which they appear and circle the item numbers that are missing.

ITEM NUMBER	CLASSIFICATION NUMBER	TITLE
		DISTRIBUTION IS BEING MADE ACCORDING TO THE 1991 ANNUAL UPDATE (i.e., RETURNED BY JULY 5, 1991).
0140-A-01	C 3.215/2:C 20-92-04	Current Construction Reports, Housing Starts, C20/92--04, April 1992, * $1.50
0273-D-12	C 55.209:79/22	Weekly Weather and Crop Bulletin, Vol. 79, No. 22, June 2, 1992
0312-B-01	D 2.15/4:7/27	Defense Issues, Vol. 7, No. 27, April 28, 1992
0325-F	~~D 101.85:15/3~~	~~INSCOM Journal, Vol. 15, No. 3, March 1992~~
0327-H	D 101.114:992/1	Military Chaplains' Review, Twentieth Anniversary Edition, 1972-1992
0467-A-07	HE 20.8217/4:5/5	NIDA Notes, Vol. 5, No. 5, 1991
0498-C-10	HE 20.8315:21	Research Monograph - 21, Imaging in Alcohol Research, 1992
0512-A-25	~~HE 22.8/6:trans.1574~~	~~Medicare Intermediary Manual, Part 3 - Claims Process, Transmittal No. 1574, May 1992,~~ *
0512-A-25	~~HH 22.8/6:trans.321~~	~~Regional Office Manual, Medicare, Transmittal No. 321, June 1992~~ **
0556-C	GP 3.24:992/2	List of Classes of United States Government Publications Available for Selection By Depository Libraries, June 1992
0582	HH 1.2:D 84/2	Together We Can..., Create Drug-Free Neighborhoods, People Making a Difference!
0612-C	I 49.44/2:Ar 1/2/992	Arapaho, National Wildlife Refuge, May 1992
0612-C	I 49.44/2:B 38/3/992	Bear River, Migratory Bird Refuge, Restoring Our Wildlife Heritage, May 1992
0648-A	I 29.9/2:H 62/5	Identification of Historic Properties: A Decisionmaking Guide for Managers, September 1988
0765	L 35.2:M 41/2/992	Materials Handling and Storing, 1992 (Revised)
0777-B-02	~~L 36.211:991/v.1/ trans.68~~	~~General Wage Determinations Issued Under the Davis-Bacon and Related Acts, Vol. 1, Transmittal No. 68, June 5, 1992, S/N 929-029-00069-2,~~ *
0777-B-03	L 36.211:991/v.2/ trans.68	General Wage Determinations Issued Under the Davis-Bacon and Related Acts, Vol. 2, Transmittal No. 68, June 5, 1992, S/N 929-030-00069-9, *
0777-B-04	~~L 36.211:991/v.3/ trans.68~~	~~General Wage Determinations Issued Under the Davis-Bacon and Related Acts, Vol. 3, Transmittal No. 68, June 5, 1992, S/N 929-031-00069-5,~~ *
0815	LC 30.2:M 18/4/992	Format Integration and its Effect on the USMARC Bibliographic Format, USMARC, 1992
0850	Pr 41.2:H 34	The President's Comprehensive Health Reform Program, February 6, 1992
		Number of Titles: 39

2 copies
1 label

Mail Claims To:

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
LIBRARY PROGRAMS SERVICE (SLDM)
PAPER CLAIMS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20401

Signature of librarian authorized to make claim _____ LIB # _____

CLEARLY PRINT OR TYPE ADDRESS AND INFORMATION ON MAILING LABEL

28

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
LIBRARY PROGRAMS SERVICES (SLDM)
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20401

LIB # 38 SL # _____

Institution _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aren, Lisa J., Webreck, Susan J., and Patrick, Mark. "Costing Library Operations - A Bibliography." Collection Building 8:3 (1980): 23-28.

Bolner, Myrtle Smith and Kile, Barbara. "Documents to the People: Access Through the Automated Catalog." Government Publications Review 18 (January/February 1991): 51-64.

Efron, Muriel C. and Stewart, Henry R. "Processing and Maintenance of Federal Documents: Summary of Three Sessions." Southeastern Librarian 24 (Winter 1975): 34-35.

Federal Depository Library Manual. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985.

Gomez, Joni. "HARLIC (Houston Area Research Library Consortium) CD-ROM Union Catalog Project." CD-ROM Professional 3 (November 1990): 62-65.

Guidelines for the Depository Library System with Minimum Standards for the Depository Library System. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1988.

Harleston, Rebekah M. and Stoffle, Carla J. Administration of Government Documents Collections. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1974.

Hayes, Sherman. "Costs, Costs, Costs...Give Me a Break!: A Brief Bibliography." The Bottom Line 2:3 (1988): 30-33.

Hernon, Peter. GPO's Depository Library Program: A Descriptive Analysis. New Jersey: Ablex, 1985.

Hernon, Peter and McClure, Charles R., "GPO's Depository Library Program: Building for the Future." Library Journal 113 (April 1, 1988): 52-56.

Informing the Nation: A Handbook of Government Information for LIbrarians. Frederic J. O'Hara, editor. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.

Jackson, Ellen. A Manual for the Administration of the Federal Documents Collection in Libraries. Chicago: American Library Association, 1955.

Jackson, Kathy M. "MARCIVE/PAC--A Simple, Easy Search System for Retrieving Bibliographic Records." The Laserdisk Professional 3 (January 1990): 80-87.

Kahles, William R., "Congress, Higher Education, and the U.S. Federal Depository Program." Government Publications Review 13 (March/April 1986): 233-242.

Morton, Bruce. "The Depository Library System: A Costly Anachronism." Library Journal 112 (September 15, 1987): 52-54.

Ponce, Jorge E. GPO Classification Manual: A Practical Guide to the Superintendent of Documents Classification System. Washington,D.C.: GPO, <1987>.

Rogers, Michael. "Marcive Offers One-Stop Shopping for Libraries." Library Journal 115 (August 1990): 26.

Schorr, Alan Edward. Federal Documents Librarianship, 1879-1987. Alaska: Denali Press, 1988.

Sendi, Karen. "Marcive, Inc. GPO CAT/PAC in Review." CD-ROM Librarian 4 (November 1989): 60-64.